

I'll explain later the background but in principle we are happy to give them access to the KEL, its just a question of when and how - as we have always said to them. This is just Freeths making noise to balance out our SOI letter, but I take Tony's point a out the judge's perception of us.

А

**Andrew Parsons** 

Partner Bond Dickinson LLP



Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com



## Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Owain Draper Sent: 14/09/2017 12:07 To: Anthony de Garr Robinson; Amy Prime; Andrew Parsons Cc: Elisa Lukas; Jonathan Gribben Subject: Re: The Post Office Group Litigation - Claim Numbers HQ16X01238 and HQ17X012637 - Inspection of Known Error Logs [BD-4A.FID26896945]

I think it boils down to this: is someone going to put in evidence to the effect that PO does not have a right to obtain a copy of the KEL?

Even we obtain such evidence, wont Cs simply apply for 3rd party disclosure against Fujitsu? I am not sure we want to set a precedent for disclosure from Fujitsu.

Best,

Owain

Owain Draper

One Essex Court, Temple

EC4Y 9AR

Switchboard: GRO

www.oeclaw.co.uk < http://www.oeclaw.co.uk/>

The content of this email is confidential and may subject to legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it permanently and inform the sender.

 From: Anthony de Garr Robinson
 GRO

 Date: Thursday, 14 September 2017 at 11:34

 To: 'Amy Prime'
 GRO

 <</td>
 GRO

 Cc: Elisa Lukas
 GRO

 GRO

 Jonathan Gribben
 GRO

Subject: RE: The Post Office Group Litigation - Claim Numbers HQ16X01238 and HQ17X012637 - Inspection of Known Error Logs [BD-4A.FID26896945]

I've not read the cases, but if our agent has access to the KEL on our behalf (in the sense of having the right or ability to inspect it), that looks as if we might well have access to it, and if we have access to it that looks as if we might well have control of it.

We have to reply by tomorrow, failing which they will issue an application which will require us to make a witness statement and which may (if we have control) result in our being bounced all over court in a very painful way. This issue needs to be bottomed out urgently.

Tony

From: Amy Prime	GRO		
Sent: 14 September 2017 11:16			
To: Anthony de Garr Robinson 4	GRO	; Andrew Parsons	
GRO	}; Owain Draper ∢	GRO	
Cc: Elisa Lukas < G	RO ; Jona	athan Gribben	
GRO		1 1101(110100)	1110151

Subject: RE: The Post Office Group Litigation - Claim Numbers HQ16X01238 and HQ17X012637 - Inspection of Known Error Logs [BD-4A.FID26896945]

Tony

Please find attached the letter of 1 September 2017 – the relevant paragraph is 1.5.

Andy may say differently, but I don't think in this letter we used the word "document" in the CPR sense but, instead, to explain that the KEL is not a fixed log or a printed handbook but a live electronic database.

In terms of control, Andy – are any issues raised by the fact that ATOS (who I believe act as POL's agent) have access to the database?

Kind regards Amy Amy Prime Solicitor

Bond Dickinson LLP

[cid:image001.jpg@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]



Follow Bond Dickinson:

[cid:image002.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]<<u>http://www.twitter.com/bond\_dickinson</u>> [cid:image003.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0] <<u>http://www.linkedin.com/company/bond-dickinson</u>>

www.bonddickinson.com<http://www.bonddickinson.com>

[cid:image004.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]<http://www.womblebonddickinson.com/>

From: Anthony de Garr Robinson **GRO** Sent: 14 September 2017 11:08 To: Andrew Parsons; Owain Draper Cc: Amy Prime; Elisa Lukas; Jonathan Gribben Subject: RE: The Post Office Group Litigation - Claim Numbers HQ16X01238 and HQ17X012637 [BD-4A.FID26896945] - Inspection of Known Error Logs

Thanks for sending the 13 October 2016 letter, Amy.

I'm a little concerned that we may be playing into their hands by provoking a CPR 31.14 application for inspection of the KEL. Unless we play our cards right, this could give them the chance to portray us as unnecessarily (and therefore suspiciously) defensive, obstructive and possibly even evasive about the KEL.

Could you also send over our letter dated 1 September 2017 - if their summary of it is fair (which I doubt) I would like to understand why we seem to have claimed that the KEL is not a document, when it plainly is, and why we don't seem to have mentioned that it is not in our control, which seems to me to be a critical point.

On the question of control, we need to be absolutely clear that we have no right to inspect or take copies of the KEL, either under the Fujitsu contract or under the law of agency (is Fujitsu holding it as our agent?), and that there is no practice under which we are habitually or usually allowed to inspect documents of this sort if we want to see them.

Best wishes,

Tony

From: Andrew Parsons	GRO		]
Sent: 14 September 2017 08:08			
To: Anthony de Garr Robinson		GRO	>; Owain
Draper	GRO		
Cc: Amy Prime	GRO	)	≥; Elisa Lukas
4	GRO		Jonathan Gribben
<	GRO		
Subject: FW: The Post Office Gro	oup Litigation - Claim N	umbers HQ16	X01238 and HQ17X012637 [BD-

4A.FID26896945] - Inspection of Known Error Logs

WBON0001197 WBON0001197

Tony, Owain

See attached - One more issue to discuss at today's con.

Mini agenda:

- 1. Current thinking on directions (look at Owain's draft Order)
- 2. Terminal preservation and inspection of KEL (as per attached).
- 3. Plan of action to CMC
- 4. Content of witness evidence and skeleton
- 5. Deloitte work what next?

A

Andrew Parsons Partner

Bond Dickinson LLP

[cid:image001.jpg@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]



Follow Bond Dickinson:

[cid:image002.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]<<u>http://www.twitter.com/bond\_dickinson</u>> [cid:image003.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0] <<u>http://www.linkedin.com/company/bond-dickinson</u>>

www.bonddickinson.com<http://www.bonddickinson.com>

[cid:image004.png@01D32D51.AB7FB2B0]<http://www.womblebonddickinson.com/>

From: Megan Atack **GRO** Sent: 13 September 2017 18:17 To: Elisa Lukas; Amy Prime; Andrew Parsons; Peter O'Connell Cc: James Hartley; Imogen Randall; Miranda Bond Subject: RE: The Post Office Group Litigation - Claim Numbers HQ16X01238 and HQ17X012637 [BD-4A.FID26896945] - Inspection of Known Error Logs

Dear Sirs

Please find attached our firm's third letter of today's date.

Yours faithfully Freeths LLP

Megan Atack

## Legal Assistant

T: F:	GRO
E:	

[freeths]<<u>https://twitter.com/freeths?ref\_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor</u>>

[reeths Website]<<u>http://www.freeths.co.uk</u>>

Freeths LLP, Floor 3, 100 Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1 4LT

Legal 500 Guide 2017:

'Top Tier' in 21 categories | 93 'Recommended' Lawyers | 17 'Elite Leading Lawyers'

Chambers UK Guide 2017:

'Ranked in 33 categories | 63 Lawyers 'Leaders in the field'

[egal 500]<<u>http://www.legal500.com/assets/pages/awards/uk/2015/home.html</u>> [egal 500] <<u>http://www.legal500.com/assets/pages/awards/uk/2015/home.html</u>> [unday Times] <<u>http://appointments.thesundaytimes.co.uk/article/best100companies/</u>>

Please be aware of the increasing risk of cybercrime and online fraud. If you ever receive an email stating a change in bank account details purporting to be from Freeths LLP, do not send any funds to the account and contact us immediately. We will never send you an email telling you that we have changed our bank account details.

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and					
protected by law. arobinson	GRO	> only is authorised t	to access		
this e-mail and any attachments. If	you are not arobinson	GRO	,		
please notify andrew.parsons	GRO		> as soon as		
possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this					
communication or attachments is p	rohibited and may be unlawful.				

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given

nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <u>http://www.symanteccloud.com</u>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <u>http://www.symanteccloud.com</u>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <u>http://www.symanteccloud.com</u>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service. For more information please visit <u>http://www.symanteccloud.com</u>